

REMARKS

1
2 The Applicant submits this paper as a fully-responsive reply to the Final
3 Official Action mailed by the Office on 12 August 2004 (hereinafter the "Final
4 Action"). The Applicant filed a Notice of Appeal on 11 February 2005, and this
5 instant paper is filed in connection with a Request for Continued Examination
6 (RCE). The Applicant submits that this paper and the related RCE are timely filed
7 on or before 11 June 2005, with a petition for a two-month extension of time to
8 respond.
9

10
11 The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the
12 rejections stated in the Final Action.
13

14 Claims 1-10 and 12-27 are pending in this application.
15

§103 Rejections

16
17 Paragraph 5 of the Final Action stated a rejection of Claims 1-10 and 12-27
18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Neibauer (The ABCs of
19 WordPerfect 8, published in 1997) in view of US Patent No. 6,480,206 to Prinzing
20 (hereinafter, "Prinzing"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.
21

22 The Applicant has amended independent claim 1 as indicated above to
23 clarify further features of the electronic document editor. These revisions are
24 believed fully supported under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, by the Applicant's
25

1 specification, at least by page 3, lines 1-10, and by page 42, lines 5-6 and lines 18-
2 20 thereof.

3 For convenience, the Applicant reproduces claim 1 as amended above, with
4 redlines included:
5

6 "1. (Currently Amended) In an electronic document editor, a highlight
7 rendering services component comprising:

8 a highlight rendering services interface that provides one or more methods to
9 enable an editor extension to control which highlight a section of an electronic document
10 is highlighted on a screen and to control a style of the highlight, the editor extension
11 determining a visual aspect of the highlight without altering the electronic document and
12 the highlight rendering services component determining non-visual functional aspects of
13 the highlight."
14

15 The Applicants respectfully submit that neither Neibauer nor Prinzing teach
16 or suggest an editor extension that controls which section of an electronic
17 document is highlighted on a screen, as recited in claim 1. Neibauer is an excerpt
18 from a user manual for the WORDPERFECT® word processor. While the Office
19 cites pages 89 and 90 of Neibauer for various aspects of highlighting text in a word
20 processor, Neibauer neither teaches nor suggests an editor extension that controls
21 which section of an electronic document is highlighted on a screen. Instead,
22 Neibauer appears to assume that the user of the WORDPERFECT® word
23 processor would control what portions of the text are highlighted, rather than
24
25

1 extension of the WORDPERFECT® word processor. On at least this basis, the
2 Applicant submits that Neibauer neither teaches nor suggests the features recited
3 above in claim 1.

4
5 Turning to the secondary reference, Prinzing, the Applicants agree that
6 Neibauer does not disclose a method in which the non-visual and visual aspects of
7 the highlight are determined by separate extensions, as stated in Paragraph 5 of the
8 Final Action. Thus, the Office cited Prinzing as a secondary reference, more
9 particularly, column 2, line 55 through column 4, line 14 of Prinzing. While
10 Prinzing may refer to various aspects of a method and apparatus for an extensible
11 editor, the Applicant respectfully submits that Prinzing neither teaches nor
12 suggests "an editor extension to control which section of an electronic document is
13 highlighted on a screen", as recited in claim 1. Prinzing lists several example
14 styles or formats, including character styles such as bold, underline, or italic,
15 (Prinzing, column 4, lines 60-65) and also including paragraph styles such as
16 indentation, margins, and spacing (Prinzing, column 4, lines 45-50). However, in
17 Prinzing, it appears that the user specifies or controls which text elements of the
18 document are viewed or displayed in these various styles or formats.

19
20 In contrast to Prinzing, the Applicant's claim 1 recites that the editor
21 extension controls which section of an electronic document is highlighted on a
22 screen, rather than the user. On at least this basis, the Applicant respectfully
23
24
25

1 submits that Prinzing does not supply the teaching or suggestion missing from
2 Neibauer to support a § 103 rejection of claim 1.

3 Based at least on the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Neibauer and
4 Prinzing, whether considered severally or in combination, do not support a § 103
5 rejection of claim 1 because they do not teach or suggest at least the above feature
6 recited in claim 1. The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and withdrawal of
7 the § 103 rejections stated in Paragraph 5 of the Final Action. These comments
8 apply equally to claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1.
9

10
11 Independent claims 10, 17, and 22 are amended to clarify further aspects of
12 the computer readable medium, the method, and the electronic document editor,
13 respectively. More particularly, these independent claims are amended to recite
14 features similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1 above. Thus,
15 the above comments directed to claim 1, and to Neibauer and Prinzing, apply
16 equally to claims 10, 17, and 22, and all claims depending therefrom.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of Claims 1-10 and 12-27 as stated in the Final Action. If personal discussion would advance prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 13 Jun 05

By: 

Rocco L. Adomato
Reg. No. 40,480
(509) 324-9256; x257